

Tally of votes September 2005 with comments

1. PROPOSAL for the IME ICC GLOSSARY –Conventional Name

Conventional name * A name, other than the official name, by which a corporate body, place, or thing has come to be known. [Source: modified from AACR2 Revision 2002 Glossary]

[Note: Glossary updated to remove “real” according to the comments in this discussion below. Also see modifications to 5.4 and 5.1.2 in response to the UK proposal on the revised Statement of principles. – Barbara Tillett]

1. **Argentina Agree—E. Barber; S. Pisano**

2. **Aruba**

3. **Bahamas—W. Johnson**

"Conventional" or "commonly accepted" can be treated as the same. Perhaps, consideration should be given to deleting "real" from the AACR2 definition and simply state "official" name.

4. **Colombia**

5. **Costa Rica—Agree; S. Gutierrez**

6. **Croatia—Agree; M. Willer**

7. **Cuba—Agree; A. García Carranza**

8. **Czech Republic—Agree; E. Lichtenbergová**

9. **Estonia—Agree; S. Nilbe**

10. **Finland—E. Murtomaa comment:** According to the

AACR 24.3C an example of the "conventional name" is: Westminster Abby not Collegiate Church of St. Peter in Westminster

AACR2

24.1 General rule

24.1A Enter a corporate body directly under the name by which it is commonly identified, except when the rules that follow provide for entering it under the name of a higher or related body (see 24.13) or under the name of a government (see 24.18).

Determine the name by which a corporate body is commonly identified from items issued by that body in its language (see also 24.3.A), or, when this condition does not apply, from reference sources.

I was looking at several reference sources, and found this entity under the name "Westminster Abby" several times. According to the PROPOSAL for the IME ICC GLOSSARY

Conventional name * A name, other than the real or official name, by which a corporate body, place, or thing has come to be known. [Source: AACR2 Revision 2002]

For me this "other than real" causes problems, even if I have lived with this definition and am ready to continue with it. For me this name form is commonly identified (and real) name form.

11. **France**

12. **Great Britain—H. Rosie comment:** I am still concerned about the wording of 5.4.1 and do not think the inclusion of a definition for conventional name clarifies the issue.

In trying to address two issues in one statement (order of data elements and selection amongst variants) the wording appears confused. If these two aspects were expressed separately this might make the principles clearer, e.g.:

[Order of data elements]

"5.4.1. The corporate name should be given in direct order, as found in manifestations or reference sources, except

5.4.1.1. when the corporate body is part of a jurisdiction or territorial authority, the authorized heading should begin with the currently used form of the name of the territory concerned in the language and script best suited to the needs of the users of the catalogue

5.4.1.2. when the corporate name implies subordination, or subordinate

function, or is insufficient to identify the subordinate body, the authorized heading should begin with the name of the superior body".

[Choice of name]

"5.4.2. When variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and/or reference sources, and this variation is not based on different presentations of the same name (e.g.

Tally of votes September 2005 with comments

full and brief forms), prefer a commonly known (or conventional) name to the official name, where this is indicated".

The above assumes that the "commonly known" name is the conventional name. If a conventional name is something other than a "commonly known" name, then I am not sure the AACR2 definition is very helpful in determining this. Like Eeva and Gunilla, I'm not clear where the boundaries lie between "real" and "conventional".

- 13. **Guatemala**
- 14. **Guyana—Agree; G. Cummings**
- 15. **Hungry**
- 16. **Italy—Agree; M. De Panicis; M. Guerrini; P. Manoni; C. Magliano**
- 17. **Jamaica—Agree; R. Runcie; L. Bobb-Semple**
- 18. **Mexico---Agree; A. Serrano**
- 19. **Netherlands Antilles**

- 20. **Panama—Agree; M. Ramos**
- 21. **Peru**
- 22. **Puerto Rico**
- 23. **Russia—Agree; N. Kasparova**
- 24. **Slovakia—Agree; J. Majerová**
- 25. **Slovenia—Agree; I. Kavčič**
- 26. **Spain—Agree; E. Escolano Rodríguez**
- 27. **Sweden—Agree; G. Jonsson comment:** I take Eeva's point regarding "real" -- wouldn't it be sufficient if the definition said "other than the official name"? On the other hand, the AACR definition has proved to work in practice, hasn't it? I would agree to keeping it.
- 28. **Trinidad and Tobago—Agree; K. Rankine**
- 29. **Uruguay**
- 30. **Venezuela**

2. Question 4 (From July-August vote) reworked (1. Glossary definition—Uniform Title; 2. Change to Section 5.5)

Background: The propose the of the July 2005 vote included some statements that described the “purpose” or “function” of uniform titles rather than principles on the form of uniform titles, specifically

{July 2005 proposed text}

5.5.1 The uniform title should make it possible to identify the work and to collocate sets o expressions of the work; and

5.5.2 the uniform title should make possible to identify an expression of the work and to collocate sets of manifestations of a given expression of the work.

Some comments in the July vote suggested that we move this information to the more general principles under 5.1.1.1 or 5.1.2.2. However, these functions of a uniform title are not exhaustive (there can be other functions) and perhaps this information does not belong in the principles at all. As an alternative, we might put such helpful information about the collocation function as part of the Glossary definition for uniform title.

IME ICC Glossary now reads:

Uniform title *1. The particular title by which a work or expression is to be identified for cataloguing purposes. Examples are collective titles and conventional titles used for collocation, form headings used to organize displays,, and unique titles used to distinguish among works with the same title. [Source: modified from AACR2] 2. The authorized form by which variant titles of different manifestations of a work, with or without author, are linked/grouped together for searching/access purposes [Source: GARR]

[Proposal No. 1]

Tally of votes September 2005 with comments

Proposed change to the first definition:

1. The particular title by which a work or expression is to be identified for cataloging purposes and for collocation in displays of sets of expressions or manifestations of the work or expression.

Or, perhaps someone can offer a more simple definition that captures these ideas? Or another solution?

* _____

[Proposal no. 2]

That leaves the 5.5 to cover only the form of the uniform title and where to go for the preferred form. For the formerly numbered 5.5.3.1 (now 5.5.1.1 on the clean copy), it was pointed out that for parallel structure we should indicate: "prefer the commonly used title as found in manifestations or reference sources."

[Note: Glossary updated and as with issue 3 below, later discussion pointed out that the use the command "prefer" should be reserved for rules, and the principles should follow languages of "should prefer, or "preference should be given to..." so the marked up and clean copies reflect this editorial correction – Barbara Tillett]

Do you agree with this change?

1. **Argentina** Agree—E. Barber; S. Pisano, G. Spedalieri
2. **Aruba**—Agree; L. Semeleer
3. **Bahamas**
4. **Colombia**—Agree; R. López
5. **Costa Rica**—Agree; S. Gutiérrez comment: I suggest a change in the definition of the UT in proposal 1: omit "or expression" but if this is not acceptable then OK with the proposal as written.
6. **Croatia**—Agree; M. Willer
7. **Cuba**
8. **Czech Republic**—Agree; E. Lichtenbergová
9. **Estonia**—Agree; S. Nilbe
10. **Finland**—Agree; E. Murtomaa
11. **France**—P. LeBœuf comment: I have one question however: is it still relevant to use the phrase "uniform title", while RDA is considering using "citation title" instead? The definition for "citation title" *could* be expanded to cover: "The particular title by which a work or

expression or manifestation is to be identified for collocation in displays of sets of expressions or manifestations of the work or expression, for unambiguous information provided in links between bibliographic records, and for cataloguing purposes." (I'm changing the order of elements in order to put the user first, rather than the cataloguer, and I'm introducing the notion of citation titles for manifestations, which should enable users to identify the manifestation referred to in links between records). (Please note however that, although I'm making an alternative proposal, I feel quite comfortable with Barbara's original proposal, and agree with it without restriction.) Besides, I think the beginning of the 1st sentence in 5.5.1, "The uniform title should be the original title or...", should be corrected to: "The uniform title should be based on the original title or...", since it is stated in 5.5 that the uniform title may include qualifiers, which are rarely to be found in manifestations or reference sources. It seems that the phrase "uniform title" is used with two distinct meanings: the "core" uniform title that serves to uniquely identify the work (and that can, in some very rare cases, include qualifiers, as for the

Tally of votes September 2005 with comments

"Coventry play" FRBR example), and the citation title that, as a rule, adds qualifiers to that "core" uniform title in order to identify various levels of expressions and manifestations (and, ultimately, could also serve to identify an individual item).

12. Great Britain—Agree; H. Rosie
13. Guatemala
14. Guyana
15. Hungary
16. Italy—Agree; M. De Panicis; M. Guerrini; I. de Pinedo
17. Jamaica—Agree; R. Runcie; L. Bobb-Semple
18. Mexico—Agree; A. Serrano comment: I suggest a minor change to Proposal 1: Omit "in displays."

19. Netherlands Antilles—Agree; M. Francisco
20. Panama—Agree; M. Ramos
21. Peru—Agree; G. Samamé; C. Zavala Barrios
22. Puerto Rico—Agree; L. Vigo-Cepeda
23. Russia—Agree; E. Zagorskaya
24. Slovakia
25. Slovenia—Agree; I. Kavčič
26. Spain—Agree; E. Escolano Rodríguez
27. Sweden—Agree; G. Jonsson
28. Trinidad and Tobago—Agree; K. Rankine
29. Uruguay—Agree; G. Jaureguiberry
30. Venezuela—Agree; M. Pirela

2. Rules v. Principles

Section in the August 2005 draft to be adjusted:

5.4.1.1. when a conventional name is commonly known (in one of the languages normally used in the catalogue), the conventional name should be preferred;

5.4.1.2. when variant forms of the name are found in manifestations and one is indicated as the official name, the official name should be preferred;

and

5.5.1.1. when there is a commonly used title in the language and script of the catalogue, preference should be given to the commonly used title as found in manifestations or references sources. Do I have your permission to make those editorial corrections?

[Note: Based on the UK recommendation for clarifying choice separately from form of name under 5.4, the 5.4.1.1 and 5.4.1.2 here have been moved to 5.1.2+ - Barbara Tillett]

1. Argentina—Agree; E. Barber; G. Spedalieri
2. Aruba
3. Bahamas
4. Colombia
5. Costa Rica—Agree; S. Gutierrez
6. Croatia
7. Cuba
8. Czech Republic—Agree; E. Lichtenbergová

9. Estonia—Agree; S. Nilbe
10. Finland—Agree; E. Murtomaa
11. France
12. Great Britain—Agree; H. Rosie
13. Guatemala
14. Guyana
15. Hungary—Agree; S. Berke

Tally of votes September 2005 with comments

16. Italy—Agree; M. De Panicis; M. Guerrini; C. Magliano
17. Jamaica
18. Mexico
19. Netherlands Antilles
20. Panama—Agree; M. Ramos
21. Peru—Agree; G. Samamé; C. Zavala Barrios
22. Puerto Rico—Agree; L. Vigo-Cepeda
23. Russia—Agree; E. Zagorskaya
24. Slovakia
25. Slovenia—Agree; I. Kavčič
26. Spain—Agree; E. Escolano Rodríguez
27. Sweden—Agree; G. Jonsson
28. Trinidad and Tobago—Agree; K. Rankine
29. Uruguay
30. Venezuela